## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

SALVADOR REYES,	)				
Plaintiff,	)				
V.	)	No.	11	С	1872
SUPERMERCADO LA VILLA, INC.	)				
and CIRINO VILLA, individual	ly) )				
Defendants.	)				

## MEMORANDUM ORDER

Supermercado La Villa, Inc. and Cirino Villa have filed their Answer, including a single affirmative defense, to the Complaint brought against them by Salvador Reyes (who sues as a putative class representative as well as on his own behalf). This memorandum order is issued sua sponte because the Answer includes multiple instances of two errors that need to be corrected.

First, a flock of defendants' denials are coupled with meaningless demands for "strict proof," whatever that may mean (see App'x ¶ 1 to State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Riley, 199 F.R.D. 276, 278 (N.D. Ill. 2001)). Those demands are stricken from Answer ¶¶ 3-6, 18, 20-24, 29, 31, 38, 42-45 and 47.

Second, a substantial set of the Complaint's allegations have been met with Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(b)(5) disclaimers, but those

Virtually all of those disclaimers are in proper form, but the one set out in Answer  $\P$  11 is not. Accordingly, as stated at the end of this memorandum order, that error will have to be corrected.

disclaimers are inexplicably (and incorrectly) followed by denials. That is of course oxymoronic--how can a party that asserts (presumably in good faith) that it lacks even enough information to form a <u>belief</u> as to the truth of an allegation then proceed to <u>deny</u> it in accordance with Rule 11(b)?

Accordingly that denial language is stricken from Answer ¶¶ 12-13, 32-34, 37, 39 and 46.

Because both of the principal errors identified here require only the deletion of language rather than revisions, they call for no amendments to the existing Answer. Accordingly a single amendment, one affecting Answer  $\P$  11 (see n.1) is ordered to be filed on or before May 18, 2011.

Milton I. Shadur

Senior United States District Judge

Dated: May 5, 2011